



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/653,281	08/31/2000	Kevin L. Beaman	M4065.0278/P27899-0818	4745
7590	03/15/2005			EXAMINER BOOTH, RICHARD A
Thomas J D'Amico Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky LLP 2101 L Street NW Washington, DC 20037-1526			ART UNIT 2812	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/653,281	BEAMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Richard A. Booth	2812	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 December 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3, 6-14, 16, 18, 21-29, 31 and 36-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3, 6-14, 16, 18, 21-29, 31 and 36-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/04.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6-14, 16, 18, 21-29, 31, and 36-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al., U.S. Patent 6,376,309 in view of Hoff et al., "Atomic Oxygen and the thermal oxidation of silicon" or Ruzylo et al., "Evaluation of Thin Oxides Grown by the Atomic Oxygen Afterglow Method".

Wang et al. shows the invention as claimed including forming a tunnel oxide 404 on a substrate 402; forming a first conductor 406 over the tunnel oxide 404; forming an insulating layer 410 over the first conductor layer, the insulating layer comprising a first oxide layer over the first conductor layer, a nitride layer over the first oxide layer, and a second oxide layer over the nitride layer, wherein the second oxide layer is formed by oxidizing said nitride layer to a thickness of fifty angstroms (see column 3, lines 39-54); forming a second conductor layer 412 over the insulating layer; etching at least the first conductor layer, the second conductor layer, and the insulating layer, thereby defining at least one stacked structure (see Figure 3).

Note, the hydrogen and oxygen present when forming the second oxide layer will react to form steam.

Wang et al. fails to show forming the second oxide layer using an oxidizing ambient in atomic oxygen to form the oxide layer with a thickness of 60% of a targeted thickness and at various temperatures and times.

Both Hoff et al., "Atomic Oxygen and the thermal oxidation of silicon" and Ruzylo et al., "Evaluation of Thin Oxides Grown by the Atomic Oxygen Afterglow Method" disclose forming an oxide layer in a microwave environment using an oxidizing method with atomic oxygen (see abstracts of both methods). In view of this disclosure, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the process of Wang et al. so as to form the second oxide layer using the process taught by Hoff et al. or Ruzylo et al. because both of these processes allow for oxide growth at low temperatures with high breakdown values.

With respect to the particular time and temperature of the oxidation, it would have been obvious to determine through routine experimentation the optimum time and temperature to conduct the oxidation process based upon a variety of factors including the desired thermal budget and would not lend patentability to the instant application absent the showing of unexpected results.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 12/30/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the references fail to show a thickness which is at least 60% of a targeted thickness. However, such a claim limitation is virtually meaningless because one of ordinary skill in the art would know prior to conducting a

process what the thickness would be within a small margin of error, especially when the process is repeated multiple times. Furthermore, the claim fails to describe how the targeted thickness is determined, so if one knows that the thickness of an oxide will be 60% of a targeted thickness then the examiner fails to see why the targeted thickness could not be 60% of the first targeted thickness when giving the claim its broadest reasonable interpretation.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Richard A. Booth whose telephone number is (571) 272-1668. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Niebling can be reached on (571) 272-1679. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Richard A. Booth
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2812

March 7, 2005